



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/648,044

08/25/2000

CHANDRA V. MOULI

MIO 0054 PA

6800

7590

01/14/2005

KILWORTH GOTTMAN HAGAN & SCHAEFF LLP
ONE DAYTON CENTRE SUITE 500
ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET
DAYTON, OH 45402-2023

EXAMINER

NADAV, ORI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/648,044

Applicant(s)

MOULI ET AL.

Examiner

ori nadav

Art Unit

2811

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 45-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 45-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 45, 47, 49-51 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wieczorek et al. (6,352,885).

Wieczorek et al. teach in figure 2E and related text a circuit structure comprising a semiconductor layer 101; a source region and a drain region 138, 139 in the semiconductor layer which are lightly doped and heavily doped with a first conductivity-type dopant; a channel region located between the source/drain regions;

a gate oxide layer located on a surface of the channel region; and

a gate electrode 104 comprising polysilicon and one or more additional layers 22 selected from the group consisting of metals, metal alloys, highly doped polysilicon, silicides, and polycides (polysilicon/metal silicide stacks) having first and second leading edges located on a portion of the gate oxide layer,

where a portion of the gate oxide layer 105 defines a first overlap region which is only beneath the gate electrode and adjacent the first leading edge and inward of the second leading edge and a second overlap region of the oxide layer (the thick oxide

Art Unit: 2811

layer located directly next to layer 105) located only beneath said gate structure and adjacent said first overlap region and said second leading edge and adjacent the drain region, the overlap region having an ion implant concentration higher than in said second overlap region and all remaining oxide layer portions extending outwardly from both the first and second leading edges of the gate structure, and which can be effective to lower the surface electrical field in the overlap region, and including a pair of spaces 137 adjacent the gate electrode.

Regarding claim 47, Wieczorek et al. teach a channel region between a pair of filed isolation regions 102, wherein all remaining gate oxide layer portions extending between said pair of filed isolation regions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2811

Claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wieczorek et al. (6,352,885).

Wieczorek et al. teach in figure 2E and related text a circuit structure comprising a

semiconductor layer 101; a source region and a drain region 120, 130 in the

semiconductor layer which are lightly doped and heavily doped with a first conductivity-type dopant; a channel region located between the source/drain regions;

an oxide layer 105, 125 formed on the semiconductor layer,

a gate electrode 104 formed on a portion of the oxide layer and having first and second leading edges, and

where a portion of the oxide layer defines a first overlap region 105 which is beneath the gate electrode and adjacent the first leading edge and inward of the second leading edge and a second overlap region of the oxide layer located beneath said gate structure and adjacent said first overlap region and said second leading edge and adjacent the drain region, the overlap region having an ion implant concentration higher than in said second overlap region 125 and all remaining oxide layer portions extending outwardly from both the first and second leading edges of the gate structure, and which can be effective to lower the surface electrical field in the overlap region.

Wieczorek et al. do not explicitly state that the impurity concentration is sufficient to lower the surface electrical field in the overlap region. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use sufficient

Art Unit: 2811

impurity concentration in Wieczorek et al.'s device to lower the surface electrical field in the overlap region in order to improve the device characteristics.

Regarding claim 56, Wieczorek et al. teach in figure 2E source and drain regions each having first and second dopants 120, 139, wherein the second dopant extending deeper into the semiconductor layer than the first dopant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, 8-9, 48 and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieczorek et al. in view of Akram.

Wieczorek et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 1 above, except using a fluorine concentration of about 1×10^{18} atoms per cubic centimeter. Akram teaches using fluorine. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a fluorine concentration of about 1×10^{18} atoms per cubic centimeter in Wieczorek et al.'s device, in order to increase the effective gate thickness of the device and since it is within the

Art Unit: 2811

skills of an artisan in order to improve the characteristics of the device by routine experimentation and optimization. Note that differences in concentration or temperature do not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See also *In re Hoeschele*, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). For more recent cases applying this principle, see *Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc.*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989), and *In re Kulling*, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding claims 8-9 and 52-53, Akram teaches a gate electrode being a gate stack 104 comprising polysilicon and one or more additional layers 22 selected from the group consisting of metals, metal alloys, highly doped polysilicon, silicides, and polycides (polysilicon/metal silicide stacks) having first and second leading edges located on a portion of the gate oxide layer. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a gate electrode comprising a gate stack electrode 104 comprising polysilicon and one or more additional layers 22 selected from the group consisting of metals, metal alloys, highly doped polysilicon, silicides, and polycides (polysilicon/metal silicide stacks) having first and second leading

Art Unit: 2811

edges located on a portion of the gate oxide layer, in Wieczorek et al.'s device, in order to reduce the contact resistance of the device.

Claims 10 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieczorek et al. in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

Wieczorek et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claims 3 and 47 above, except a gate electrode is comprised of a layer of polysilicon, a layer of titanium nitride deposited on the polysilicon layer, and a layer of tungsten deposited on the titanium layer. APA teaches in figure 1 a gate electrode is comprised of a layer of polysilicon 18, a layer of titanium nitride 20 deposited on the polysilicon layer, and a layer of tungsten 22 deposited on the titanium layer. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a gate electrode comprising of a layer of polysilicon, a layer of titanium nitride deposited on the polysilicon layer, and a layer of tungsten deposited on the titanium layer in Wieczorek et al.'s device, in order to reduce the contact resistance of the device.

Claims 11-12, 14 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieczorek et al. in view of Motoyoshi et al. (JP 6-53492).

Regarding claim 12, Wieczorek et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 3 above, except using the transistor in a CMOS configuration.

Motoyoshi et al. use a transistor having a gate oxide comprising fluorine in a CMOS configuration. it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2811

time the invention was made to use Wieczorek et al.'s transistor in a CMOS configuration in order to use the device in a specific application which requires a CMOS device.

Regarding claims 11 and 57, Motoyoshi et al. teach in figure 7 a pair of conductive studs and an interlevel dielectric layer provided on the semiconductive layer, the interlevel dielectric layer have a pair of through holes, each accommodating one of each the pair of conductive studs, and one of each the pair of conductive studs contacting one of each the source/drain regions. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a pair of conductive studs through an interlevel dielectric layer provided on the semiconductive layer, the interlevel dielectric layer have a pair of through holes, each accommodating one of each the pair of conductive studs, and one of each the pair of conductive studs contacting one of each the source/drain regions in Wieczorek et al.'s device in order to operate the device in its intended use. Note that the device would not operate without external connections.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieczorek and Motoyoshi et al., as applied to claim 12, and further in view of Akram. Wieczorek et al. and Motoyoshi et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 12 above, except using a fluorine concentration of about 1×10^{18} atoms per cubic centimeter. Akram teaches using fluorine. It would have been obvious to a

Art Unit: 2811

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a fluorine concentration of about 1×10^{18} atoms per cubic centimeter in Wieczorek et al. and Motoyoshi et al.'s device, in order to increase the effective gate thickness of the device and since it is within the skills of an artisan in order to improve the characteristics of the device by routine experimentation and optimization. Note that differences in concentration or temperature do not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). For more recent cases applying this principle, see Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc., 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989), and In re Kulling, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 45-57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2811

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1660**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ori Nadav', is positioned above the printed name and title.

O.N.
January 11, 2005

ORI NADAV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800